



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in this case. In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Goto (U.S. patent 6,829,023) in view of Ishizuka et al. (U.S. patent 6,707,438 herein "Ishizuki"). That rejection is traversed, as discussed next.

In claim 1, the reset signal supply section supplies to the pixels *different reset signals associated with the main wavelengths of light to be emitted from the luminous elements*. Independent Claim 5 recites a similar feature. With that structure, each reset signal is capable of initializing a control voltage applied from the capacitor to the drive control element into a level equal to the inherent threshold voltage V_{th} of the drive control element, and is capable of correcting the initialized level to a level suited for the main wavelength of light to be emitted from the luminous element. Thus, with the claimed structure it becomes possible to simplify the circuit configuration required to cancel variations in the threshold voltage V_{th} of the drive control element and attain luminance balance for a desired white chromaticity between the luminous elements.

Goto discloses a reset circuit in FIG. 9. However, Goto does not disclose or suggest the claimed "reset signal supply section" noted above. Goto is further not directed to a technique for attaining a luminance balance for a desired white chromaticity between luminous elements. Thus, Goto does not even address a relation between control voltages of drive control elements and luminance balance, and Goto does not even address a level-correction of the control voltage by a reset signal.

Ishizuka does not cure the deficiencies in Goto. Ishizuka discloses a reset driving method that accelerates the rise time of light emission in luminous elements. In Ishizuka

electric charge stored in the luminous elements are discharged as a reset operation performed prior to the driving of the luminous elements by voltages between anode and cathode lines arranged in a lattice shape on a simple matrix display panel. To discharge the electric charge, all the anode and cathode lines are connected to the ground terminal (0V). In addition, Ishizuka discloses supplying different offset voltages VR, VG, and VB to the anode lines for red, green, and blue luminous elements in the reset operation to eliminate a difference between the periods in which the voltages across the luminous elements reach predetermined light emission regulating voltages for the red, green, and blue colors, thereby causing the red, green, and blue luminous elements to simultaneously emit light. In the simple matrix display panel, each of the luminous elements is directly driven by a voltage between the corresponding anode and cathode lines.

However, in Ishizuka the display panel does not require drive control elements, such as in the claimed invention. Thereby, in Ishizuka the offset voltages VR, VG, and VB are applied to the red, green, and blue luminous elements without any intention to cancel variations in the threshold voltage V_{th} of each of drive control elements. Thus, it is apparent that the offset voltages VR, VG, and VB in Ishizuka are not equivalent to the reset signals of the claimed invention. For these foregoing reasons, Ishizuka cannot cure the above-noted deficiencies in Goto.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit neither Goto nor Ishizuka disclose a “reset signal supply section that supplies to the pixels different reset signals associated with the main wavelength of light to be emitted from the luminous elements”, as recited in independent claim 1. Independent claim 5 similarly recites supplying a reset signal.

Moreover, as noted above with such a claimed element a reset signal is capable of initializing a control voltage applied from a capacitor to a drive control element and is

capable of correcting an initialized level to a level suited for a main wavelength of light to be emitted from the luminous element. Neither Goto nor Ishizuka even address such a technical concept.

Thereby, the claims as rendered are believed to distinguish over the combination of teachings of Goto in view of Ishizuka.

Accordingly, in view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding grounds for rejection have been traversed. No further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\EHK\24's\245771\245771US-AMENDMENT-9.9.06.DOC